

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending.

In response to the Patent & Trademark Office's (PTO's) request for a new title clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, Applicants believe the present title is descriptive of the invention and request the PTO to suggest an acceptable title.

Claims 1-8 comply with the enablement requirement

The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is hereby traversed. Contrary to the Patent & Trademark Office's (PTO's) assertion, claim 1 appears to be enabled and Applicants fail to understand the PTO's strained reading of the claim language. The PTO asserts that the claim recites "a first computer system containing a second computer system;" however, the PTO appears to be incorrectly reading the claim language. The preamble appears to recite that the first computer system is the computer system to which the troubleshooting is applied and the first computer system is not the computer system which is performing the troubleshooting. The PTO appears to be ignoring the comma positioned between "a first computer system" and "comprising." As recited in the claim language, the claim is to "[a] system **for troubleshooting a first computer system**" and not a first computer system for troubleshooting as appears to be asserted by the PTO. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, likewise, comply with the enablement requirement for at least the reason advanced above with respect to claim 1, from which they depend. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are patentable over *Hind et al.* (US Published Application 2004/0128585)

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hind* is hereby traversed. A rejection based on 35 USC §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. *Hind* fails to disclose all elements of the presently claimed subject matter.

First, *Hind* fails to disclose at least an electronic document including troubleshooting information as claimed in claim 1. As asserted by the PTO, *Hind* appears to disclose a technical support server 120 which includes “a database of debugging scripts 140 which can reference by way of an index, one or more pre-stored debugging scripts 150” which are “configured to exercise the application 170 so as to pinpoint a particular condition.” *Hind* at paragraph 24. The *Hind* debug scripts are not an electronic document including troubleshooting information as claimed. *Hind* fails to disclose at least troubleshooting information, e.g., a knowledge base document as described at at least paragraph 15 of the instant specification, as part of an electronic document. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Second, *Hind* fails to disclose the claimed set of troubleshooting commands for execution related to the troubleshooting information of the electronic document as claimed in claim 1. *Hind* fails to disclose a relationship or association between a set of troubleshooting commands and troubleshooting information of an electronic document because as set forth above, *Hind* fails to disclose an electronic document including troubleshooting information as claimed. Further, *Hind* fails to disclose a relationship between debug scripts 140, 150 and an electronic document including troubleshooting information. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For each of the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over *Hind* and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, include further limitations, and are patentable over *Hind* for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 2-8 should be withdrawn.

Further with respect to claim 2, *Hind* fails to disclose embedding of a troubleshooting command set in an electronic document including troubleshooting

information as claimed. The *Hind* debug scripts appear to include a command set and not troubleshooting information. For at least this additional reason, claim 2 is patentable over *Hind* and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is patentable over *Hind* for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1. *Hind* fails to disclose at least an electronic document including troubleshooting information and/or a set of troubleshooting commands for execution related to the troubleshooting information of the electronic document as claimed in claim 1. For each of the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 9, include further limitations, and are patentable over *Hind* for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 9. The rejection of claims 10-16 should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 is patentable over *Hind* for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1. *Hind* fails to disclose at least an electronic document including troubleshooting information and generating the electronic document based on combined troubleshooting information input and troubleshooting command input as claimed in claim 1. In contrast, *Hind* appears to disclose debug scripts 140, 150 and not an electronic document based on troubleshooting information input and troubleshooting command input. For each of the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 17, include further limitations, and are patentable over *Hind* for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 17. The rejection of claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Yassine Faihe et al.



Randy A. Noranbrock
Registration No. 42,940
Telephone: (703) 684-1111

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599
Telephone: (408) 447-8133
Facsimile: 281-926-7212
Date: **December 22, 2006**
RAN/